

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
ROCK HILL DIVISION

Ekoko K. Avoki; Francisco K. Avoki,	)	C/A No. 0:17-1141-DCC-PJG
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	
v.	)	<b>ORDER</b>
	)	
City of Chester, S.C.; Police of Chester, S.C.;	)	
PTL Covington; Doe I-XXX,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
	)	

---

The plaintiffs, proceeding *pro se*, filed this civil rights action. This matter is before the court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.). Plaintiffs filed two motions seeking to amend the Second Amended Complaint pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15. (ECF Nos. 115 & 126.) Defendants filed a response in opposition to the motions (ECF No. 137),<sup>1</sup> and Plaintiffs filed a reply (ECF No. 145).

In their first motion, Plaintiffs seek to add claims related to the arrest of their daughters. However, those claims would only accrue to their daughters, who are not parties to this action. In their second motion, Plaintiffs seek to raise new allegations about actions by unidentified City of Chester police officers that occurred on May 20, 2018. However, under Rule 20 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, these allegations do not appear to arise out of the same transaction, occurrence, or series of transactions or occurrences as Plaintiffs' claims in their Second Amended Complaint. Accordingly, it is

---

<sup>1</sup> In that response, Defendants argue that Plaintiff should be denied leave to amend because the court's deadline to file amended pleadings pursuant to the amended scheduling order (ECF No. 111) has passed, and because the amendment would be futile.

**ORDERED** that Plaintiffs' motions to amend are **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**



Paige J. Gossett

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

July 19, 2018  
Columbia, South Carolina